



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,424	02/06/2004	John V. Frangioni	14952.0320	2070
27890	7590	04/04/2007	EXAMINER	
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036			JASANI, ASHISH S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3737
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/772,424	FRANGIONI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ashish S. Jasani	3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :10/14/05
8/31/05 11/23/05 1/12/06 10/26/04.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 7181266.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they teach of a multilayered semiconductor nanocrystal for in-vivo imaging.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (g)(1) during the course of an interference conducted under section 135 or section 291, another inventor involved therein establishes, to the extent permitted in section 104, that before such person's invention thereof the invention was made by such other inventor and not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed, or (2) before such person's invention thereof, the invention was made in this country by another inventor who had not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed it. In determining priority of invention under this subsection, there shall be considered not only the respective dates of conception and reduction to practice of the invention, but also the reasonable diligence of one who was first to conceive and last to reduce to practice, from a time prior to conception by the other.

2. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barbera-Guillem (USPN 6333110).

With regards to claims 1 and 6-8, Barbera-Guillem et al. teaches of nanocrystal with an outer layer such that "Semiconductor nanocrystals ("quantum dots") are known in the art. Generally, quantum dots can be prepared which result in relative monodispersity; e.g., the diameter of the core varying approximately less than 10% between quantum dots in the preparation. Examples of quantum dots are known in the art to have a core selected from the group consisting of CdSe, CdS, and CdTe (collectively referred to as "CdX"). CdX quantum dots have been passivated with an inorganic coating ("shell") uniformly deposited thereon" (column 2, lines 10-18).

With regards to claims 2 and 19-20, and 22; Barbera-Guillem et al. teaches of the diameter such that "Functionalized nanocrystals typically should have a substantially uniform size of less than 100 Angstroms, and preferably have a substantially uniform size in the range of sizes of from about 2 nm to about 10 nm (diameter)" (column 9, lines 27-31).

With regards to claims 4 and 15, Barbera-Guillem et al. teaches of emission wavelength of 750nm (column 3, line 61).

With regards to claims 13-14 and 16-18, Barbera-Guillem et al. teaches of tissue, vasculature, and surgical removal of tissue (Example 4).

With regards to claim 21, Barbera-Guillem et al. teaches of "the light source suitable for exciting the multiple species of functionalized nanocrystals may comprise a spectrum (visible, or UV, or a combination thereof)" (column 15, line 21).

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bawendi et al. (US PGPUB 2001/0040232).

Bawendi et al. teaches of a semiconductor nanocrystal with an outerlayer (abstract). Bawendi et al. teaches of a polydentate ligand (¶ 47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5, 9-12, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barbera-Guillem (USPN 6333110) in view of Bryant et al. (Physica E 11 (2001) 72-77).

Barbera-Guillem et al. teaches of nanocrystal with an outer layer such that "Semiconductor nanocrystals ("quantum dots") are known in the art. Generally, quantum dots can be prepared which result in relative monodispersity; e.g., the diameter of the core varying approximately less than 10% between quantum dots in the preparation. Examples of quantum dots are known in the art to have a core selected from the group consisting of CdSe, CdS, and CdTe (collectively referred to as "CdX"). CdX quantum dots have been passivated with an inorganic coating ("shell") uniformly deposited thereon" (column 2, lines 10-18). Barbera-Guillem et al. does not teach of a multi-layer semiconductor nanocrystal.

Bryant et al. teaches of "multilayer nanocrystal heteronanostructures" (Page 73, ¶ 1).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to combine the Barbera-Guillem et al. nanocrystal with the Bryant multilayer nanocrystal so "that the shell can act as an electron and hole trap" (Bryant, page 77, ¶ 1).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashish S. Jasani whose telephone number is 571-272-8025. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 9:30 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (571) 272 - 4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ASJ



BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPPLYING PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3737